



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,164	01/19/2006	Jaouad Zemmouri	LOM-0044	9042
23599	7590	09/25/2008	EXAMINER	
MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			JOHNSON III, HENRY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/25/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/521,164	ZEMMOURI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Henry M. Johnson, III	3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9 and 10 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 9, 2008 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed April 9, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive regarding the apparatus. The structure of Lin provides a laser with overlapping parameters that clearly anticipates the apparatus of claim 1. Since the power levels of Lin overlap those of the applicant, the laser is inherently non-thermal. The limitations based on intended use or results (occlude abnormal retinal vessels), have no impact on the device structure.

Applicant's arguments regarding the method claims (6, 7, 9 and 10) are persuasive and the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections are withdrawn. However, a new 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection relating to new matter is made as provided herein.

The examiner suggests the method claim include the steps of "using no external photosensitizer", "selecting a laser light source with a wavelength between 1.26 µm and 1.27 µm" and "illuminating the macula", and remove the terms not in the original disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applying to the retina a therapeutic laser is new matter. The original disclosure provides for illumination of the macula with the light, but not specifically the retina. Irradiation through the cornea and crystalline lens is likewise new matter, not previously disclosed. Occluding abnormal retinal vessels is new matter with regard to the 1260 to 1270 nanometer wavelength. Previous disclosure has been in the background of the disclosure and is regarding different wavelengths with the use of photosensitizers.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4, 5, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is indefinite for being dependent on a cancelled claim.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the laser source" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 is indefinite for being dependent on a cancelled claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the laser source" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,258,082 to Lin.

Regarding claim 1, Lin discloses an apparatus consisting essentially of a therapeutic light source (Fig. 1, # 1) which enables a non-thermal therapeutic light beam (Fig. 1, # 2) to be emitted in a manner similar to light sources used in the context of dynamic phototherapy, wherein said light source is designed to emit a therapeutic light beam presenting an emission wavelength lying in the range 0.5 microns to 3.2 microns (abstract, line 5), which includes the claimed range. Lin discloses that the beam causes "minimum thermal effects" (Col. 4 lines 40-49), i.e. a non-thermal beam. Lin discloses a power of the therapeutic light beam in the range of about 0.1 W to 5.0 W (Col. 9, line 21), which overlaps the claimed range. A recitation with respect to the manner in which an apparatus is intended to be employed does not impose any structural limitation upon the claimed apparatus.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,258,082 to Lin as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,200,309 to Rice et al. Lin discloses the apparatus according to claim 1, but does not specify an optical fiber Raman laser. Rice et al. teaches the use of an optical fiber Raman laser (Fig 9, # 310) for photodynamic therapy with lasers in a variety of emission wavelengths, including the min-infrared region (Col. 12, lines 15-18). Rice et al. further teaches the optical fiber Raman laser comprising a pump laser diode (Fig. 9, # 320), an ytterbium-doped optical fiber laser (Col. 12, lines 16-19), and a Raman converter (Fig. 9, # 400) serving to transpose the wavelength of the beam coming from the ytterbium-doped optical fiber laser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ytterbium-doped optical fiber laser as taught by Rice et al. in the invention of Lin as it is capable of providing the parameters suggested by Lin.

### ***Double Patenting***

Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 2 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application

are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry M. Johnson, III whose telephone number is (571) 272-4768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 5:30 AM to 2:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Henry M. Johnson, III/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739

/HMJ/  
9/23/2008